UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/602,823	06/25/2003	Olivier De Lacharriere	016800-515	1993	
7590 05/14/2008 BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P. P.O. Box 1404			EXAMINER		
			DUTT, ADITI		
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		1649			
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			05/14/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/602,823	LACHARRIERE ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Aditi Dutt	1649		

	Aditi Dutt	1649	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>14 April 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appetor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	which places the r (3) a Request
a) \boxtimes The period for reply expires <u>6</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(the content of the co	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejection	on.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origin	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee be action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
	but prior to the data of filing a brief	will not be entered be	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, by (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in beti	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w);	E below);	
appeal; and/or	ion form for appear by materially rec	idenig of emipmyning a	10 100400 101
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21. See attached Notice of Non-Cor	mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		,	,
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 	owable if submitted in a separate, t	imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the
7. A For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		be entered and an e	xplanation of
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 37,38,41-44 and 47-54.			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 39,40,45,46 and 6	<u>4-67</u> .		
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See continuation sheet.	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/Jeffrey Stucker/	/Aditi Dutt/		
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1649	Examiner, Art Unit 1649		

Continuation of 11: Does not place the application for condition of allowance because:

112-1st paragraph - Written description

Claims 37-38, 41-44, 47-54 stay rejected because

112-1 Written description issues remain. With the exception of capsaicin as the peripheral nervous stimulant, and a specific unattractive sensation, the skilled artisan cannot envision all peripheral nervous stimulants and all unattractive sensation to detect skin neurosensitivity.

103(a)

Claims 37-38, 41-44 and 48-54 stay rejected.

Applicant traverses the rejection on the basis of an alleged different purpose demonstrated by Robinson et al. Applicants assert that while the instant Application relates to a method identifying a person with sensitive skin, Robinson et al. aim at characterizing a product. Applicants further argue that Robinson et al. do not reduce the stimulant dose to identify a person with sensitive skin. Applicants thus conclude that the person of ordinary skill will not be motivated to perform tests using chemicals on sensitive skin to determine skin sensitivity.

Applicants' arguments are considered but not persuasive because of reasons stated in the last Office Action dated 25 January 2008 (pages 4-7). The claimed invention is directed to a method of evaluating level of neurosensitivity. Regardless of whether Robinson et al.'s purpose is to characterize a product, Robinson et al still teach a method to assess the neurosensory skin irritation using capsaicin, comprising the same steps as in the claimed invention. Robinson et al., further teach that the method allows the classification of subjects having sensitive skin versus normal skin. Furthermore, contrary to Applicant's allegation about the dose of the stimulant, optimization within prior art conditions or through routine experimentation is obvious to one skilled in the art. Therefore, the claimed invention as a whole is prima facie obvious over the teachings of Robinson et al. and stay rejected.

ΑD

7 May 2008